



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/666,257	09/21/2000	Adrian Yap	PD-200057	8880
20991	7590	02/27/2006	EXAMINER	
THE DIRECTV GROUP INC			BOCCIO, VINCENT F	
PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATION RE/R11/A109			ART UNIT	
P O BOX 956			PAPER NUMBER	
EL SEGUNDO, CA 90245-0956			2616	

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/666,257	Applicant(s) YAP ET AL.	
	Examiner Vincent F. Boccio	Art Unit 2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment & RCE of 2/13/06.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 15 and 18-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 13, 14, 16, 17 and 24-27 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2616

DETAILED ACTION

The Group and/or Art Unit location of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 2616.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to previously rejected and amended claims 1-12, 15, 18-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1-12, 15, 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Chauvel et al. (US 6,369,855) and Muto (US 5,799,129), supporting reference for an MPEG decoder having its own memory (two US references added

Art Unit: 2616

for clarity Park 6,754,274, Fig. 4 or Igarashi et al., US 5,539,466, Fig. 19) in view of Venkat (US 5,857,083).

The examiner incorporates by reference the last action against the claims 1-12, 15, 18-23.

The claims have been further amended/narrowed to further recite wherein the graphics accelerator processor including an associated memory.

Applicant has amended to be distinguishable by narrowing the graphics accelerator processor including a memory, wherein the MPEG decoder memory is deemed inherent if not obvious to perform the decoder loop to use a memory, deemed required therefore, inherent, as shown by Park Fig. 4, memory 50 and 20 for an MPEG decoder, or Igarashi, Fig. 19, both MPEG decoders have a memory to perform the decoder loop in view of processing inter-frames (P & B type frames), therefore, the MPEG decoder has, has its own memory of Chauvel, inherent is not obvious.

The claims have been amended to include wherein the graphics accelerator processor has a memory, interpreted in light of applicants disclosure Fig. 3, a memory 62 and processor 66, base on the claim language used is that narrow.

The combination as applied provides for the MPEG decoder having a memory and Muto provides for an accelerator element including memories to reverse the playback frames, decoded frame memories, which have to be controlled by a controller or processor, the examiner will accept the arguments that the combination fails to provide a graphics processor associated with the memory acting like an accelerator controlled by Muto controller, in view of the processor/controller of Muto, not being completely dedicated to the accelerator operations.

The examiner cites, Venkat, which teaches a graphics accelerator in Fig. 6, col. 9, etc., being element SD1 with memory M1, the element SD1 deemed to read on the processor and Mi the associated memory, wherein in accord to Fig. 11 the prior art, may not be able to handle digital audio and motion video (col. 1), thereby invented a new accelerator to alleviate the prior art issues, as taught by Venkat.

Art Unit: 2616

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination by, utilizing, a graphics accelerator, processor & memory accelerator, as taught by Venkat, deemed obvious to utilize the functionality or method of Muto (reversing the frames with respect to the memory), and to utilize a graphics accelerator having its own processor and memory to perform the same, as is deemed to be obvious to those skilled in the art.

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Claims 13-14, 16-17, 24-25, 26-27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Contact Fax Information


Any response to this action should be faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, for communication as intended for entry,
this Central Fax Number as of 7/15/05

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to the examiner of record, Monday-Tuesday & Thursday-Friday, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM Vincent F. Boccio (571) 272-7373.

Primary Examiner, Boccio, Vincent
2/21/06


VINCENT BOCCIO
PRIMARY EXAMINER